

I. INSTANCES WHERE DOUBLE PATENTING ISSUE CAN BE RAISED

A double patenting issue may arise between two or more pending applications, >or< between one or more pending applications and a patent**. A double patenting issue may likewise arise in a reexamination proceeding between the patent claims being reexamined and the claims of one or more applications and/or patents. Double patenting does not relate to international applications which have not yet entered the national stage in the United States.

A. *Between Issued Patent and One or More Applications*

Double patenting may exist between an issued patent and an application filed by the same inventive entity, or by *>a different< inventive entity having a common inventor **, and/or by **>a common assignee/owner. Double patenting may also exist where the inventions claimed in a patent and an application were made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement as defined in 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(2) and (3).< Since the inventor/patent owner has already secured the issuance of a first patent, the examiner must determine whether the grant of a second patent would give rise to an unjustified extension of the rights granted in the first patent.

B. *Between Copending Applications—Provisional Rejections*

Occasionally, the examiner becomes aware of two copending applications >that were< filed by the same inventive entity, or by different inventive entities having a common inventor, and/or by a common assignee >, or that claim an invention resulting from activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement as defined in 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(2) and (3),< that would raise an issue of double patenting if one of the applications became a patent. Where this issue can be addressed without violating the confidential status of applications (35 U.S.C. 122), the courts have sanctioned the practice of making applicant aware of the potential double patenting problem if one of the applications became a patent by permitting the examiner to

make a “provisional” rejection on the ground of double patenting. *In re Mott*, 539 F.2d 1291, 190 USPQ 536 (CCPA 1976); *In re Wetterau*, 356 F.2d 556, 148 USPQ 499 (CCPA 1966). The merits of such a provisional rejection can be addressed by both the applicant and the examiner without waiting for the first patent to issue.

The “provisional” double patenting rejection should continue to be made by the examiner in each application as long as there are conflicting claims in more than one application unless that “provisional” double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in >at least< one of the applications. **

>

1. **Nonstatutory Double Patenting Rejections**

If a “provisional” nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting (ODP) rejection is the only rejection remaining in the earlier filed of the two pending applications, while the later-filed application is rejectable on other grounds, the examiner should withdraw that rejection and permit the earlier-filed application to issue as a patent without a terminal disclaimer. If the ODP rejection is the only rejection remaining in the later-filed application, while the earlier-filed application is rejectable on other grounds, a terminal disclaimer must be required in the later-filed application before the rejection can be withdrawn.

If “provisional” ODP rejections in two applications are the only rejections remaining in those applications, the examiner should withdraw the ODP rejection in the earlier filed application thereby permitting that application to issue without need of a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer must be required in the later-filed application before the ODP rejection can be withdrawn and the application permitted to issue. If both applications are filed on the same day, the examiner should determine which application claims the base invention and which application claims the improvement (added limitations). The ODP rejection in the base application can be withdrawn without a terminal disclaimer, while the ODP rejection in the improvement application cannot be withdrawn without a terminal disclaimer.

Where there are three applications containing claims that conflict such that an ODP rejection is made in each application based upon the other two, it is not sufficient to file a terminal disclaimer in only one of the applications addressing the other two applications. Rather, an appropriate terminal disclaimer must be filed in at least two of the applications to link all three together. This is because a terminal disclaimer filed to obviate a double patenting rejection is effective only with respect to the application in which the terminal disclaimer is filed; it is not effective to link the other two applications to each other.

2. Statutory Double Patenting Rejections (35 U.S.C. 101)

A terminal disclaimer cannot be filed to obviate a statutory double patenting rejection.

If a “provisional” statutory double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in one of the applications (but not both), the examiner should withdraw the rejection in that application and permit that application to issue as a patent, thereby converting the “provisional” double patenting rejection in the other application into a double patenting rejection when the application issues as a patent.

If a “provisional” statutory double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in both applications, the examiner should withdraw that rejection in the application with the earlier filing date and permit that application to issue as a patent. If both applications were filed on the same day, the applicant should be given an opportunity to elect which of the two should be allowed. In either situation, the examiner should maintain the double patenting rejection in the other application as a “provisional” double patenting rejection, which will be converted into a double patenting rejection when one application issues as a patent.<

C. Between One or More Applications and a Published Application - Provisional Rejections

Double patenting may exist *>where< a published patent application and an application >are< filed by the same inventive entity, or by different inventive entities having a common inventor, and/or by a common assignee. >Double patenting may also exist where a published application and an application claim inventions resulting from activities undertaken

within the scope of a joint research agreement as defined in 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(2) and (3).< Since the published application has not yet issued as a patent, the examiner is permitted to make a “provisional” rejection on the ground of double patenting >when the published application has not been abandoned and claims pending therein conflict with claims of the application being examined<. See the discussion regarding “provisional” double patenting *>rejections< in subsection B. above.

D. Reexamination Proceedings

A double patenting issue may raise a substantial new question of patentability of a claim of a patent, and thus be addressed in a reexamination proceeding. *In re Lonardo*, 119 F.3d 960, 966, 43 USPQ2d 1262, 1266 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (In giving the *>Director< authority under 35 U.S.C. 303(a) in determining the presence of a substantial new question of patentability, “Congress intended that the phrases ‘patents and publications’ and ‘other patents or publications’ in section 303(a) not be limited to *prior art* patents or printed publications.” (emphasis added)). Accordingly, if the issue of double patenting was not addressed during original prosecution, it may be considered during reexamination.

>Double patenting may exist where a reference patent or application and the patent under reexamination are filed by inventive entities that have at least one inventor in common and/or are filed by a common owner/assignee. Where the patent under reexamination was granted on or after December 10, 2004, double patenting may also exist where the inventions claimed in the reference and reexamination proceeding resulted from activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(2) and (3), and if evidence of the joint research agreement has been made of record in the patent being reexamined or in the reexamination proceeding. A double patenting rejection may NOT be made on this basis if the patent under reexamination issued before December 10, 2004. See MPEP § 804.04. The prior art exclusion under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) cannot be used to overcome an obvious double patenting rejection. See MPEP § 706.02(l) for more information on 35 U.S.C. 103(c). See MPEP § 2258 for more information on making double patenting rejections in reexamination proceedings.<